The Chicago Tribune.

VOL. 23. CHICAGO, MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1869. NUMBER 166.

WASHINGTON.

Senate Judiciary to Set Georgia Back.

The New Department of Home Affairs.

New York and the Fifteenth Amendment.

Tazewell's Nomination to be Withdrawn.

Special Dispatch to The Chicago Tribune.
WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.

SENATE.

The Senate Judiciary Committee had another business meeting, and a majority determined to report upon the bill in favor of admitting Georgia to representation. The Republican members of the Committee, however, say that the action of the majority will not be binding upon the Senate, and that they will oppose the bill when it comes before the Senate for action. They are in most cases in favor of the admission of Georgia, and will, if necessary, and may perhaps bring in their bill and report it to the Senate.

JUDGE GRIER.

A resolution was introduced by Senator Sherman, providing that the Committee on Pensions be instructed to inquire into the propriety of granting to Judge Grier, of the Supreme Court, the pay of the office he has held so honorably for so many years, and which he declined to accept. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

TREATY TO BE WITHDRAWN.

The President has given directions to withdraw the treaty recently negotiated by Secretary Motley with Great Britain, which was apparently so well disposed that collusion between Motley and Thornton was suspected. The treaty was sent to the Senate last week by the President, and had the time for acting in the case of the Alabama claims been limited to the 4th of March, instead of indefinitely, from the other documents in the case, it would have been rejected.

TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENTS.

The question of Governor Reid, of Colorado, and the Governor of Wyoming, will be given, either during the present session or the next, to the Committee on Territories.

TO BE ASSOCIATED PRESS.

TELEGRAM.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—Hon. Anson Burlingame, Minister to China, presented a telegram from the Chinese Government, announcing the appointment of Chih Kang, Chief Minister of the Board of Punishments, as Envoy Extraordinary to the United States and Europe.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING.

Mr. Clark, Congressional Printer, has published a statement of the work done by the Government Printing Office during the past year. All of the work ordered by Congress has been executed, and the Congressional Record is now printed and delivered to members on the morning following the day of publication.

THE CUSTOM-HOUSE PATRONAGE.

The Government of the United States Railroad Company, incorporated a few days since by the Legislature of Texas, for the purpose of building a railroad from Galveston to the Rio Grande, has petitioned the President to appoint the Collector, Surveyor, Appraiser, and Naval Officer of Galveston, Texas, Commissioners to receive subscriptions to the capital stock of the company. The Commissioners have been appointed, and the books will be opened in Galveston on the 15th inst. The Collector of Galveston is a Democrat, and may perhaps bring in their bill and report it to the Senate

The Tribune.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1869.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

The New York Herald, in a leader on the divorce granted to Mrs. M. Forrest, says will be seen that the Chancellor of New York has the right to grant divorces. Why, then, should the Legislature of Indiana be asked to do so? Or why should Mrs. Forrest, of New York, have to come to Indiana to get a divorce? What the Governor of New York have granted to Indiana are told under the laws of New York, for they do not prohibit that an Indiana divorce is governed by the laws of New York, but that they are void by the laws of New Jersey. If their decision is correct in New York, therefore, any financial Court in Indiana will decide the same way in the case of Mrs. Forrest.

THE MOTHERLAND DIVORCE

Much of It Obtained in Pictures—Proceedings and Documents.

[Dec. 9 Correspondence of the Chicago Tribune.]

MARY A. WINSLAND vs. SAMUEL WINSLAND—

Petition filed August 31, 1868.*

At the same time and place the affidavit of one O. H. Harrison, non-resident, was filed, and also the following:

State of Indiana, Morgan County, ss. In the Court of Common Pleas, March Term, A. D. 1868.

Mary A. Winsland vs. Samuel Winsland. Complaint for Divorce.

Be it remembered that on the 31st day of August, A. D. 1868, the plaintiff herein filed her complaint herein, and the affidavit of O. H. Harrison, that the defendant herein is a non-resident and cannot be found in this county, and that he resides in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, and that he is not in the military service of the United States, as he verily believes. Whereupon the defendant is notified to appear and answer to said complaint on or before the first day of the next term of this court, to be begun and held on the first Monday of October, A. D. 1868, at the court-house in Martinsville, in said county, or the same will be taken as confessed, and the cause proceeded in accordance therewith.

Witness my hand and the seal of said court, this 31st day of August, A. D. 1868.

[SEAL.] JOHN HARPER, Clerk.

Harrison & Shirley, Attorneys for plaintiff.

And on the 2d day of October, A. D. 1868, the said cause came on to be heard on the bill of complaint, the affidavit of publication of notice of the pendency of said action, and the affidavit of the non-residence of the defendant, and was submitted to the court for its decision thereon, and the court, having heard the evidence and being duly advised in the premises, finds that the defendant has been duly notified of the pendency of said action, and that he has failed to appear and answer the complaint herein, and that the allegations of said complaint are true, and that the plaintiff is entitled to the relief prayed for in her complaint.

It is therefore considered by the court that the plaintiff be divorced from the bonds of matrimony now existing between her and the defendant, and that the defendant pay the costs of this action.

Witness the Hon. John Harper, Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, and the seal of said court, this 2d day of October, A. D. 1868.

[SEAL.] JOHN HARPER, Clerk.

* Power and attorney to Hon. John Harper, Clerk, &c.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, August 31, 1868.

[SEAL.] JOHN HARPER, Clerk.

Certificate of publication of notice in the Martinsville Republican, a weekly newspaper published in Martinsville, Morgan County, Ind., for three consecutive weeks, the first publication being on the 3d day of September, A. D. 1868, and the last on the 24th day of September, A. D. 1868.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, August 31, 1868.

[SEAL.] JOHN HARPER, Clerk.

Harrison & Shirley, Attorneys for plaintiff.

Daniel McFarland, Jr., was laid at Indian

Petition filed August 31, 1868.*

At the same time and place the affidavit of one O. H. Harrison, non-resident, was filed, and also the following:

State of Indiana, Morgan County. In the Court of Common Pleas, March Term, A. D. 1868.

Mary A. Winsland vs. Samuel Winsland. Complaint for Divorce.

Be it remembered that on the 31st day of August, A. D. 1868, the plaintiff herein filed her complaint herein, and the affidavit of O. H. Harrison, that the defendant herein is a non-resident and cannot be found in this county, and that he resides in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, and that he is not in the military service of the United States, as he verily believes. Whereupon the defendant is notified to appear and answer to said complaint on or before the first day of the next term of this court, to be begun and held on the first Monday of October, A. D. 1868, at the court-house in Martinsville, in said county, or the same will be taken as confessed, and the cause proceeded in accordance therewith.

Witness my hand and the seal of said court, this 31st day of August, A. D. 1868.

[SEAL.] JOHN HARPER, Clerk.

Harrison & Shirley, Attorneys for plaintiff.

* Power and attorney to Hon. John Harper, Clerk, &c.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, August 31, 1868.

[SEAL.] JOHN HARPER, Clerk.

Certificate of publication of notice in the Martinsville Republican, a weekly newspaper published in Martinsville, Morgan County, Ind., for three consecutive weeks, the first publication being on the 3d day of September, A. D. 1868, and the last on the 24th day of September, A. D. 1868.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, October 2, 1868.

[SEAL.] JOHN HARPER, Clerk.

Harrison & Shirley, Attorneys for plaintiff.

Daniel McFarland, Jr., was laid at Indian

Petition filed August 31, 1868.*

At the same time and place the affidavit of one O. H. Harrison, non-resident, was filed, and also the following:

State of Indiana, Morgan County. In the Court of Common Pleas, March Term, A. D. 1868.

Mary A. Winsland vs. Samuel Winsland. Complaint for Divorce.

Be it remembered that on the 31st day of August, A. D. 1868, the plaintiff herein filed her complaint herein, and the affidavit of O. H. Harrison, that the defendant herein is a non-resident and cannot be found in this county, and that he resides in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, and that he is not in the military service of the United States, as he verily believes. Whereupon the defendant is notified to appear and answer to said complaint on or before the first day of the next term of this court, to be begun and held on the first Monday of October, A. D. 1868, at the court-house in Martinsville, in said county, or the same will be taken as confessed, and the cause proceeded in accordance therewith.

Witness my hand and the seal of said court, this 31st day of August, A. D. 1868.

[SEAL.] JOHN HARPER, Clerk.

Harrison & Shirley, Attorneys for plaintiff.

* Power and attorney to Hon. John Harper, Clerk, &c.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, August 31, 1868.

[SEAL.] JOHN HARPER, Clerk.

Certificate of publication of notice in the Martinsville Republican, a weekly newspaper published in Martinsville, Morgan County, Ind., for three consecutive weeks, the first publication being on the 3d day of September, A. D. 1868, and the last on the 24th day of September, A. D. 1868.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, October 2, 1868.

[SEAL.] JOHN HARPER, Clerk.

Harrison & Shirley, Attorneys for plaintiff.

Daniel McFarland, Jr., was laid at Indian

FOREIGN

Today.

THE ANTI-PAPAL COUNCIL.

A Liberal speaker inaugurates fierce debate on the opening of the session—Opposition to Papal Infallibility—Bishops of all parts of the world—The Council and the Pope—Other matters.

Special Dispatch to The Chicago Tribune.

PARIS, Dec. 13.—Monsignor Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, opened the Council at Rome with a brief address. His health has not been sufficiently restored to allow him to read the whole of the discourse which he had prepared for the occasion.

Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State, then read the Pope's address, which was received with great enthusiasm by the assembled prelates.

The Pope, in his address, said that the Council was called to consider the evils which afflict the Church, and to find remedies for them. He then referred to the Vatican Council, and to the decrees of that body, and declared that he would maintain them in spite of all opposition. He then referred to the Eastern Church, and to the efforts which had been made to bring it back to the Catholic faith. He also referred to the Old Catholics, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Protestants, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Jansenists, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Greek Church, and to the efforts which had been made to bring it back to the Church. He then referred to the Old Catholics, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Protestants, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Jansenists, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Greek Church, and to the efforts which had been made to bring it back to the Church.

Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State, then read the Pope's address, which was received with great enthusiasm by the assembled prelates.

The Pope, in his address, said that the Council was called to consider the evils which afflict the Church, and to find remedies for them. He then referred to the Vatican Council, and to the decrees of that body, and declared that he would maintain them in spite of all opposition. He then referred to the Eastern Church, and to the efforts which had been made to bring it back to the Catholic faith. He also referred to the Old Catholics, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Protestants, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Jansenists, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Greek Church, and to the efforts which had been made to bring it back to the Church.

Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State, then read the Pope's address, which was received with great enthusiasm by the assembled prelates.

The Pope, in his address, said that the Council was called to consider the evils which afflict the Church, and to find remedies for them. He then referred to the Vatican Council, and to the decrees of that body, and declared that he would maintain them in spite of all opposition. He then referred to the Eastern Church, and to the efforts which had been made to bring it back to the Catholic faith. He also referred to the Old Catholics, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Protestants, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Jansenists, and to the efforts which had been made to bring them back to the Church. He then referred to the Greek Church, and to the efforts which had been made to bring it back to the Church.

Greek Succession.

LONDON PRESS ON PRINCE NAPOLEON.

The Pall Mall Gazette says that the Prince Napoleon's speech will be interpreted, whether he intended it or not, as a declaration of war against the Church of Rome.

The Times condemns the Prince in severe terms, and declares that the Emperor Napoleon has not the slightest sympathy with the Prince's views.

The Standard says that the Prince Napoleon's speech will be interpreted, whether he intended it or not, as a declaration of war against the Church of Rome.

The Daily News says that the Prince Napoleon's speech will be interpreted, whether he intended it or not, as a declaration of war against the Church of Rome.

The Morning Post says that the Prince Napoleon's speech will be interpreted, whether he intended it or not, as a declaration of war against the Church of Rome.

The Daily Telegraph says that the Prince Napoleon's speech will be interpreted, whether he intended it or not, as a declaration of war against the Church of Rome.

The Morning Advertiser says that the Prince Napoleon's speech will be interpreted, whether he intended it or not, as a declaration of war against the Church of Rome.

The Daily Telegraph says that the Prince Napoleon's speech will be interpreted, whether he intended it or not, as a declaration of war against the Church of Rome.

The Morning Post says that the Prince Napoleon's speech will be interpreted, whether he intended it or not, as a declaration of war against the Church of Rome.

The Daily News says that the Prince Napoleon's speech will be interpreted, whether he intended it or not, as a declaration of war against the Church of Rome

THE PULPIT.

The Members of the Old and New School Presbyterians.

How an Honest Deity Can be Reasonably Maintained.

Brief Statement of the Cause of the Disruption.

Sermon by Rev. D. C. Hoyne.

The Rev. D. C. Hoyne, pastor of the North Presbyterian Church, corner of Clark and Jackson streets, preached from the text at the early part of the morning service. He said: In many of the churches of the Old and New School Presbyterian denominations, the first Sabbath in December is observed as Communion Sunday, and I have chosen it for the purpose of the Christian Church, and more especially of the Presbyterian Church, as a most appropriate occasion for the discussion of the subject of Church Unity. The text which I have selected for this morning's discourse is found in the 17th chapter of John, 21st verse: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

There are certain phases of theological teaching from which the Christian mind of every believer shrinks with instinctive repugnance. Such, for example, is the doctrine of Supreme Will, as taught by Calvin, which holds that every thing that occurs in the universe is the result of the direct and positive decree of God, and that nothing can happen contrary to His will. Such, also, is the doctrine of Universalism, which teaches that all men will be saved, irrespective of their character or conduct in this life. Such, also, is the doctrine of Annihilation, which teaches that the wicked will be destroyed, and that the righteous will be rewarded with eternal life. Such, also, is the doctrine of Spiritualism, which teaches that the spirits of the departed can return to this world and hold communion with the living. Such, also, is the doctrine of Infidelity, which teaches that there is no God, no future state, no responsibility, no judgment, no heaven, no hell. All these doctrines are repugnant to the moral sense of mankind, and are not proper subjects of Church discussion.

It is not our purpose to-day to argue and discuss the merits of these doctrines. We have referred to them, which we think right, and which we have a right to do, for the purpose of showing that there are subjects in the Christian world which are not proper subjects of discussion in the Christian Church. Such subjects, however important they may be in their proper sphere, are not proper subjects of Church discussion.

It is not our purpose to-day to argue and discuss the merits of the doctrines of Calvinism, Arminianism, Universalism, Annihilation, Spiritualism, Infidelity, or any other doctrine which we think wrong. We have no desire to do so. We have no time to do so. We have no inclination to do so. We have no right to do so. We have no authority to do so. We have no reason to do so. We have no motive to do so. We have no object to do so. We have no desire to do so. We have no intention to do so. We have no purpose to do so. We have no wish to do so. We have no thought to do so. We have no idea to do so. We have no plan to do so. We have no scheme to do so. We have no project to do so. We have no design to do so. We have no aim to do so. We have no end to do so. We have no motive to do so. We have no reason to do so. We have no inclination to do so. We have no desire to do so. We have no wish to do so. We have no thought to do so. We have no idea to do so. We have no plan to do so. We have no scheme to do so. We have no project to do so. We have no design to do so. We have no aim to do so. We have no end to do so.

There are certain phases of theological teaching from which the Christian mind of every believer shrinks with instinctive repugnance. Such, for example, is the doctrine of Supreme Will, as taught by Calvin, which holds that every thing that occurs in the universe is the result of the direct and positive decree of God, and that nothing can happen contrary to His will. Such, also, is the doctrine of Universalism, which teaches that all men will be saved, irrespective of their character or conduct in this life. Such, also, is the doctrine of Annihilation, which teaches that the wicked will be destroyed, and that the righteous will be rewarded with eternal life. Such, also, is the doctrine of Spiritualism, which teaches that the spirits of the departed can return to this world and hold communion with the living. Such, also, is the doctrine of Infidelity, which teaches that there is no God, no future state, no responsibility, no judgment, no heaven, no hell. All these doctrines are repugnant to the moral sense of mankind, and are not proper subjects of Church discussion.

It is not our purpose to-day to argue and discuss the merits of these doctrines. We have referred to them, which we think right, and which we have a right to do, for the purpose of showing that there are subjects in the Christian world which are not proper subjects of discussion in the Christian Church. Such subjects, however important they may be in their proper sphere,